

Transcript of Alameda County Board of Supervisors Discussion of Urban Shield
March 27, 2018

[Transcribed by American Friends Service Committee from video at:
http://alamedacounty.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=2&clip_id=5100

[4:26:30]

Ahern: I heard there was a concern about weapons and guns that we have. Well, they're mission-specific and we bring out that type of weaponry when there is a need for that type of event like you saw in Las Vegas or an active shooter or where there's multiple shooters.

Carson: Do you employ at all the whole thing in your chain of command, implicit bias?

Ahern: The idea of racism and it pertaining to Urban Shield is a difficult topic to discuss. We've invited nations, things that have transpired since 2007, 2007, we were approached by people in the Muslim community indicating that they wanted to see us be more involved. WE invited a team from Jordan. Not only did we invite a team from Jordan, we invited a female team from Jordan. We worked with people from Brazil during the time of, they were organizing and managing the World Cup and the Olympics. They wanted to come and learn from us. We've invited teams from Taiwan, South Korea, Mexico, every nation throughout the world. It's not that we invite them – they learn about our event and make a request to attend and how do they go about being in attendance. We strive to be free of racism. I can't say that 100% of our people are completely free of racism or implicit bias or that I am completely free of implicit bias. People indicating that I'm a white male, and yes I am that's how I grew up. We work on those things very hard to prevent, avoid, educate and continue on the best we can.

Chan: Okay, I usually speak last, but I think I earned the right to speak after running this meeting. I had a couple questions and then I had a couple comments. Of the \$5.5 million, \$4 million is given out in contracts in an RFP to train them, and then the \$1.5 million is for Urban Shield, is that correct?

Ahern: It's pretty close. We have about a million dollars plus in administrative cost as well. So then it gets down to \$4.5 million, and of that \$4.5, 1.5 goes to Urban Shield, and the remainder goes to the other programs that you are aware of.

Chan: Okay, and the other programs, some of them include some real-life scenarios, sit that correct?

Ahern: There's not very many role-playing scenarios other than what we have at Urban Shield. There are some, but it's very limited.

Chan: Okay, let's see what else I want to ask you. In terms of what Supervisor Carson asked you, have you ever considered in the RFP including training for the trainers on implicit bias? I mean just to be trained on it as part of the RFP, like when you give out those grants.

Ahern: I heard the request from many of the speakers about funding. The funding is associated directly to training with regards to terrorism. So the other request to put the training dollars to another venue, would have to come from another funding source.

Chan: That's not a real long training, right? Is it a half day?

Carson: It's like everyone is having that discussion throughout California right now.

Chan: You can have a training that's not very expensive, right?

Carson: You can.

Chan: We're not talking about, like, days of it.

Ahern: And we do do that type of training in the academy and in our continued professional training programs and things of that nature. It just doesn't get funded out of the Urban Shield funding.

Chan: Okay, but the people who conduct the exercise, or the contractors, have they been through the implicit bias training from some other source?

Ahern: If they've been associated with law enforcement most likely they have. It's a requirement through the Police Officer Standard in Training.

Chan: Well, this to me has been a really difficult issue for the Board. And I want to thank your department for sending me all the information I asked for. I had hoped that Public Protection could have had some meetings about this, because we asked a lot of questions two weeks ago, and I actually did get all the answers from your office, which I really appreciate, to understand the difference between the OES and Urban Shield funding, what Santa Clara was doing. I got answers to all of those questions. So what it made me understand is that OES in and of itself isn't probably enough prep training for the disasters and all this other thing. So I realized that after reading, the two things are slightly distinct but complementary.

Ahern: One of the comments, one of the speakers today was that the likelihood of that event would be one in a hundred. And quite frankly that's what we're training for, we're training for that one in a hundred event that doesn't normally happen and we want to make sure that this area, this region is prepared to respond.

Chan: I also want to say that as myself I've been a victim of crime before where I had to call the police and I also have family that live right near the site of 9/11. So I actually visited 9/11 about four days after it happened and it was just a horrific situation where people in the neighborhood were seeing body parts on the ground. So I understand these things can happen, we're just blessed that it hasn't happened. There have been other incidents like Oikos and others, but it could happen. These things do happen. That being said, I think the issue of our, our society's relationship with police goes through ups and downs over history. Most of us have been active for a very long time. I became active in the 60s, when there was a huge distrust between the communities and the police, especially after the Kent State shooting, where I know some of you were alive then, right? After students were shot for protesting against the

Vietnam War. And then after that it kind of calmed down a little bit and trust was rebuilt, but trust has to be rebuilt. I think the problem with Urban Shield now is that a lot of stuff has happened since you started the program. Was the first year 2007?

Ahern: 2007, that's correct.

Chan: Yeah, 2007. So, if we look objectively since 2007 a lot of things have occurred. First of all, we had a depression, basically, and a lot of people have become poor and more desperate. And people have been kicked out of their housing. Income inequality has really grown in society, so people are very very upset about that. I think also because of that, the inequality, there is also more of a fear of violence in communities of color, and particularly most recently among immigrants, with the new administration. These things didn't happen in 2007, these are all things that have happened since that time. And also there have been officer-involved shootings, you know some of them, I'm not going to say what, but there's been a lot of them, a lot of officer-involved shootings in the last 5, 6 years. So I think there's a lot of greater societal division and very great polarization. So I think regardless of what we try to do the Urban Shield exercise itself is viewed as a show of force, which in this atmosphere – like I said this is not 2007 – in this atmosphere given all the stuff that I said has happened is probably not the most appropriate way to protect the community. [applause] I'm not saying this to please anyone or anything. I have really thought about this a lot for the last two weeks. Anyone who knows me knows I really do my homework. I am not calling the Sheriff's Department names or anything. In the unincorporated area that I represent your officers do great work, and it's nothing like that. But I just think that in the time we're in there are valid concerns about this show of force. And I'm not saying that's the purpose of it, but that's the way it's taken. And given what's happened, the way society is now, the legitimate fears that immigrants have about being rounded up and deported or locked away, whether they committed a crime or not, right? And this is just me, I'm just going to say my opinion today, because we're supposed to lead and say our opinion. I think it would be much better served to put the full 5.5 million into a pot and RFP out the whole thing, and not have Urban Shield and use that full pot of money for training, to RFP for training. [applause, 4:37:18] That's where I am, with due respect.

Ahern: Some of the comments made today were of the officer-involved shootings that are viewed as unjust and mistakes by law enforcement and the fact that we're producing warriors. What we're trying to do by putting on Urban Shield is to eliminate those mistakes and make our tactical officers and so they don't make mistakes in critical incidents. Next, an individual mentioned that we're building a warrior mentality. And the Under-sheriff and I have authored a number of, at least 2 recent memorandums to our people in regards to being guardians and not warriors. And you heard from the students at Chabot College and they came in and they talked about how they support the program and how they trust us. One of the things we do and we try to invite the students and the children to see how we do our business, how we go about it, so we can build their trust, and they can associate with us in a world where we're not doing enforcement, where we're doing training, where we're doing meals, where we're providing logistics, and so we are doing that. Another comment was that we should be doing water distribution. We've trained in water distribution, it's call C-POD, Community Points of

Distribution. We do that training. And you said, A show of force. And quite honestly if I'm going to send my people into an active shooter situation, I have to make sure they have superior firepower with outstanding equipment, like ballistic vehicles, so they can arrive at the scene safely, so they can remove people who have been shot safely and they're not killed at the site. That is a very unique event, and it requires very specialized training, and we do that once a year.

Chan: Supervisor Miley or Valle?

Miley [4:39:40]: Yeah, first of all before I share some questions I just want to thank all the speakers for speaking this morning, this afternoon. Good to hear everyone's opinions on this matter even though I think some people's opinions are a bit, what's the word, inflammatory. That might a good way of describing it. I don't want to associate myself with any inflammatory comments. But I do think it was good hearing from the array of speakers. I also think it's important to point out, you know my district goes from Oakland to Pleasanton. I didn't hear any folks speaking from Pleasanton, nor from the unincorporated areas of Castro Valley, Cherryland, Ashland and Fairview. So I've made a notation of people were speaking and were from my district. Those who were not from my district were from Oakland and most of them I recognize. Some of the other speakers who spoke who are my constituents and I've known for years. That's not to say that your concerns are not valid concerns. I just wanted to make sure folks understood I was watching and listening to who came from my district. And I think it's important that we look at the fact that what we're attempting to do is represent the views of everybody and not be bullied by anybody, to represent the needs and concerns of the public and do the right thing for the broader public. I also think it's important to note that it was raised that there's an issue of trust. [4:41:24]

Miley[4:43:30]: Anything that's associated with militarization, war games, gun shows, is it possible to decouple out of this year's Urban Shield.

Ahern: We have a plan to have militarized equipment isolated from the vendor show. But the vendor show is a training element for our people, where we bring in new technology and the technology is part of the scenarios that they're going to see in the next two days. So the team leaders and the teams need to go in and be trained on the equipment that they're going to be using on Saturday and Sunday. And so that's going to be in one section. And things that are more militarized will be isolated from the general public and the other vendors.

Miley: If we were to, I don't know what the board's going to do, if we were to support Urban Shield funding for this year, would you be open to working with the Board and the public around the planning for Urban Shield in 2019, so it's more responsive to the concerns we've heard today based on the militarization, the war games, the guns, all that sort of stuff.

Ahern: The other term you said inflammatory terminology, you said war games. We don't put on war games. We duplicate real life events where people's lives were lost. No games about it. And it's not military techniques, we use law enforcement techniques and tactics. We don't use

military equipment, we use our police equipment. Next, I've invited this Board since 2007 to come on out to Urban Shield and take on a role. So you are more than welcome, you have been invited, I welcome your input. I've taken your input, I've taken your suggestions. I've tried to deal with them the best I can for planning for the next year. So you're invited to this year and I hope you can give us some direction on how you'd like us to proceed in 2019.

Miley: I've been out to Urban Shield. I was out to one of the scenarios last years at, I think Chabot Dam. And I've been out to Urban Shield before, and I've been to the dinner, and my staff have been out as well. So, you know I don't want to throw out the baby with the bath water. But I'm trying to get a way to see how we can address—and you know Sheriff, often the reality might be one thing but it's the perception. If people have the perception that Urban Shield is this, that and the other, we need to try to address both the reality and the perception, and what I'm trying to get at is not just inviting the Board out and entertaining our thoughts on this but really sitting down with us and the community to plan Urban Shield 2019, so not only the reality but the perception is addressed.

Ahern: I offer that, I agree to that, more than willingly. And more community involvement on how we train will help us and people that are involved to see how we are going about doing our training.

Miley: Cause I'm going to [holds up paper] I do think the recommendations, I appreciate the fact that some people came forward with some solid recommendations. I think the last couple speakers had some solid recommendations. One of the other speakers had some solid recommendations. And I don't know if the Sheriff's Department has a copy of the recommendations. Have you seen these?

Ahern: I listened to them very closely, the recommendations were to support receiving the UASI funding of \$5.5 million and to deal with things that were more involved with training the community and I agree with those things, and we're trying to do just that, and it's simply that I can't order people in the community to come to our training. We offer it to them and we expand that and we're getting more and more people. And as to your point of perception, I have to do a better job of marketing Urban Shield and making sure that the perception and reality are closer in parallel.

Miley: More specifically Sheriff I'm talking about recommendations A, B, C, D, and E in terms of action. Around item E it says the Board does not approve recommendations 4, 5 and 6 in the Board letter to enter into agreements and approve costs for Urban Shield. What's your opinion of that particular recommendation

Ahern: I haven't had a chance to study, I've only to listened to what they're saying. When you're referring to B, D, E and 4, 5, 6, I haven't—

Miley: You haven't had a chance to digest it. Is there any reasons why we need to take action on this today?

Miley: And the reason is?

Ahern: Funding.

Miley: So you need us to take action today?

Ahern: In order to receive the funding we need agreement by today.

Miley: So we need to decide if we're supporting it, if we're going to put some conditions on it, or we're not going to support it, etc. Okay. That's helpful.

Voice from public: What about the report?

Miley: I think the report's going to come from the Public Protection Committee on April 12. I think Supervisor Valle said that. I think in the past I've been, I've chaired the Public Protection Committee when I was on City Council, I've chaired the Public Protection committee here for a few years, and I know, I recognize having worked in the community quite a bit, that not all police are corrupt and not all people of color are criminals, we recognize that. But sometimes that reality and the perception are different. I'm going to wait if I'm going to decide to support Urban Shield without any conditions, because I think for me, minimally, to support the funding for Urban Shield for this coming year, 2018, we have to get more of a commitment, we have to get more in line with what we've heard today for 2019. We need to really achieve that and make that happen. I've said it before, and I think the Sheriff knows this and the County Administrator, I've said to the County Administrator when the Sheriff started Urban Shield, I wasn't in support of Urban Shield, because I didn't think we needed Urban Shield the first few years, and I said that. But I've grown to be a supporter of Urban Shield just because of what I've seen happen in the world, what I've seen happen in our country, what I see happen, it's like shootings, it's almost the new norm. I'm not just talking about shootings of unarmed, or perceived shootings of people of color. I'm talking about other types of shootings as well, shootings in schools, shootings at church grounds, the callous use of firearms. I'm not a proponent of people surrendering their firearms, because as I said before I think appropriate gun control is something we should strive for, but I'm not one to say we should not have people have guns and have them be responsible. That's something that I'm opposed to. But I do think it's important that we should try to figure out how we can build that trust as the chief from Hayward was pointing out and a couple other folks pointed out that trust, and I think that's what we need to strive for. So depending on what the motion is, if the motion is to fund Urban Shield I want it to be contingent on the fact that we're going to make changes, cause I know you've made changes, but we're going to make significant changes in 2019 and going forward. If the motion is not to fund Urban Shield in 2018 then I need to understand the implications of that for this year's Urban Shield of 2018. I think that's all I want to say at the moment.

Valle: Just a housekeeping. The task force brought forward their report to the whole board on February 26 which was a Tuesday. By then the Public Protection committee agenda was already set for March 8, and so we did not have a chance to visit the outcome of the task force findings

at Public Protection in March. And therefore I was proposing that we do that conversation on April 12 at 9 a.m. And the reason for that was this finding by the task force, and I will read it verbatim: By majority vote, the Urban Shield task force suspended its discussion on Question 5 and did not vote on the draft response or draft recommendations for this question. The rationale was that because the Urban Shield task force does not represent vulnerable communities or those most impacted by Urban Shield it is not the right body to make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors about the community impact of Urban Shield." So they agreed to table that item. As a consequence, I think today we've heard from the community in terms of what their feelings and sentiments are on this issue. And we've heard from multiple sides. Just let me say for the record that the Hayward City Council, who in the words of one of the speakers are the people who I represent in my district, all seven council members voted in support of Urban Shield, and that's a fact. Secondly, let me say that the chief, who was most articulate in my perspective, of the chiefs I've spoken to about this issue, Chief Kohler who spoke at the podium was very sympathetic to both sides of the issue. And that's the way he runs his department, it's a reflection of his leadership. And I think what he said was right on. It's trust, trying to build trust over mutual concerns, and deciphering over the noise and getting right down to the issue. The militarization of Urban Shield and that perception versus disaster preparedness and how we prepare for something that is inevitable such as an earthquake or something unexpected. Other people who spoke, including the students from Chabot – now a lot of those students live in my neighborhood, they come from my community in Dakota, and CORE – Congregations Organizing for Renewal – are also from my neighborhood. We have law enforcement, we have a lot of Union City police officers went to James Logan High School who are now on the police force. So another person that also supports Urban Shield in its current form is the chief of police of Union City and the mayor of Union City. And that's the people that I represent. I also met with the police chief of Newark, who is in my district. I had a long conversation with him, and then was called and contacted by the mayor of Newark, Al Nagy, and he supports Urban Shield. So in my district, I've spoken to three mayors and all four police chiefs, and as you may guess, all four chiefs were in support of Urban Shield. However, I think that the – this is the philosophical point that I want to make – and that is for me, I'm at a crossroads, myself. As someone who grew up in a community that was oppressed by police, someone who grew up in a community where our chief of police was assassinated in a Catholic church, where I went to church, Our Lady of the Rosary Church, he was assassinated by two gunmen. One of them was quasi-a member of the Brown Berets at the time, way back when they were very active in my neighborhood. I have a real problem with that, because the oppression that we faced from law enforcement in my neighborhood as a result of that got me started in public service. So the police chief who was assigned to take over the Union City Police Department was William Kirkpatrick. And he came down like a ton of bricks on brown people in my neighborhood where I lived. And that was really hurtful for me and my family and the people in my neighborhood. So we started a program and we started going into Santa Rita jail, with the blessing of the city manager of Union City, and at that time Glen Dyer was the sheriff of Alameda County to talk to young people coming back to our neighborhood so it would not have fear and they would start looking for work and ways out of the issue of gun violence, the issue of substance abuse, domestic abuse, and dropping out of school and early pregnancies. So this is something that's critically important to me as a human being. I don't like the

militarization of our police departments. But I do represent a lot of people in my district that would like to see Urban Shield continue, but perhaps in a different form. And the sheriff is nodding his head and he understands that. And I think that we can arrive at a mutual place. And I like Supervisor Chan's comment where she said, one of the problems we have in our community is that we don't listen to each other. And there was a lot of folks who weren't listening, but simply cheering and clapping, but for the other side they were hissing and making other noises. And everyone's entitled to that, and I get it, but I think the one of the key things for me is I want to change Urban Shield. I don't want to take away the positive side of Urban Shield. I want to take away the negative side of Urban Shield. And if the sheriff is in agreement I think we can have that dialogue, I look forward to it. Dr. Davis has agreed to have that dialogue and facilitate some of it in April, and I want to get to that discussion. Because I think that Alameda County is really better than a lot of other counties in the state of California. We show leadership in a lot of areas, and this is one where we can show a lot of leadership that would have tremendous impacts across the globe, because we can do something different with Urban Shield that has potential. Let's not throw it away just because we don't agree with its tactics. Let's change the mechanism and make it better. So I'm in favor of that and again the sheriff nods in agreement. I hope that's where we arrive today.

Chan: Okay, does somebody want to make a motion? Or [motions to Haggerty]

Haggerty: You know I don't have a lot to add to the many meetings we've had on this. I would thank the people who've come out on both sides. I would say that I'm happy, I don't know if everyone just kinda got tired, but I'm happy that things kind of calmed down. I was a little concerned in the morning that we wouldn't hear the whole thing out. As I've told everybody before, I really don't like repeating myself from meeting to meeting but I've actually attended Urban Shield events and watched scenarios. The scenario I remember most is the cafeteria when someone had gone in to the cafeteria and started shooting up a bunch of kids that were supposed to be going to college and how they responded with paramedics to essentially get the bad guys out and also systematically attend to the kids that were there. And I remember that because I know that my kids have several times, both my daughters and my sons have volunteered to help serve as people helping in the scenarios being victims. I think the thing that comes through the most for me, and it's always a tough discussion, I realized I sit up here, I'm the white male, I'm the guy, right? And sometimes people even take things out on me, but it happens. But I really am sensitive to the racism part of it. I really think, sheriff, I don't know what's going to happen today, but I have seen pictures through the education from the advocates that would say that there's maybe undertones, not that you support, but somebody, I don't know what the wrap is around the neck, but I saw pictures of those, I don't know what that's called. [someone shouts out] What is it? Okay, biyo, whatever. [audience] I don't know what it is, I'm sorry. [audience] Can I finish my statement? Thank you. [audience] I know, I asked you, you said what it is. [audience – Haggerty pounds desk]

Chan: Okay, let's finish this. [audience] Let's not get into that.

Haggerty: I think it might be helpful if you had some sort of a sensitivity officer, somebody that's assigned to kind of watch out for that stuff, while the event is happening, to make sure that—

Ahern: So the tactical guys wear that to protect themselves from the wear and tear of being up 48 hours and the sweat and it is a protective item. When it's hot, they pour water on it and it cools them down, cause they're wearing a lot of gear. And when it's cold it keeps them warm.

Haggerty: I understand that [audience], and I really wish the audience, I have sat here all day and listened to you, so if you'd please let me speak now without yelling at me. It's really easy to yell at me, isn't it? It's really easy. There's more athletic type things, my kids play sports and there's wraps that are all one color, maybe like a blue or something like that. That's why I'm saying be sensitive maybe to the color that they're wearing. Cause I do know what you're saying, they do wear things to keep cool. But when it's a plaid color, something like that, it can take on a tone. But I do think it would be smart to have a sensitivity officer, somebody that's watching during the planning, that something does not have those, the overtones. And maybe they're just unintended consequences, but sometimes things will slip through and you can't be everywhere but it might be helpful if you did have somebody that was there that did watch. That's basically all that I wanted to say. I've had, I'll leave it at that.

Ahern: And I'll agree to have the sensitivity officer, and the oversight person to take a look at make sure we're in compliance. I think we're squared away with that already.

Chan: Supervisor Carson.

Carson: Yeah, let me see if we can get to some point here. And I'm saying that based on the fact that at least I haven't, and I fully believe that no member of this Board has been involved in the last couple of weeks in serial vote counting. We haven't been discussing it amongst ourselves. So for us to have this debate, have this discussion, is not that we're sitting here thinking that we know what the outcome is. And I want to go on record about that, at least if that's the case I haven't been apprised to it. And it seems like everybody else is shaking their head regarding it. I probably have personally had more conversations about Urban Shield than any other Board member since 2007 regarding Urban Shield, not just because I represent the district that probably has the most people who come out to speak out against it, but because of the fact that I've had personally a number of conversations, starting in 2007,
[5:06:57]

Carson: I though I heard in Supervisor Chan's suggestion or recommendation, that even as we move towards that, in this year's Urban Shield, that there's a structure to deal with those volatile and

Obviously some of that is the exhibition and who participates. And obviously some of that is the exercises which give the appearance and really are more in line with a military approach to an urban issue. I think I heard that, you need to correct me.

[5:16:53] Chan: Well, I guess I'm looking for a motion. I'm sort of willing to go further than that. And again we don't discuss these things in advance. So I actually like the recommendation that was put forward to accept, to put numbers, to accept A, B, and C but not D, E and F. What that would do is that there would not be an Urban Shield exercise. So I would rather see the full 5.5 RFP'ed out. And I think it could include some scenario. The Sheriff was saying there isn't funding for that, but if you add in the 1.5 million, then the different regional areas would have funding. So I could try that motion. I don't know if it will pass.

Ahern: The economy of scale, by the manner in which we run the event allows for the smaller agencies to participate. When you start breaking down the scenarios, they become very costly to bring in the experts, the evaluators, the role players and acquire the locations. So the fact that we can get the 60 sites in a three-day period saves us millions of dollars.

Chan: Okay, I guess that would just have to be dealt with. I can't dollar and cent it because I don't really know, and obviously you've been doing it all these years so you know the cost, but I'm willing to take that risk. So I'll make a motion and see if it goes, which would be to accept A, B, and C, 33.

Carson: I'll second that.

Haggerty: So can I just understand what the impact is of that?

Ahern: It would mean that we're not trained this year.

Haggerty: Okay.

Chan: Okay. So I guess we'll vote on that one and we'll see how it goes. All in favor:

Chan, Carson: Aye

Chan: You guys are- you're a no, no, no. Okay. Fails.

[5:19:13] Haggerty: I'll move the recommendation as outlined in the Board letter.

Chan: The recommendation is to approve this entire thing, right? 33.

Haggerty: [nods]

Miley: I can only support that if it's contingent upon significant reforms for Urban Shield for 2019, based on --

Haggerty: Based on what you did with the Sheriff--

Miley: what we've heard today, because --

Haggerty: and the fact that he said he would add a sensitivity monitor in this one.

Miley: That, and, I think it's important, the Sheriff has already been planning for Urban Shield for 2018. So what I'm saying is before he starts planning Urban Shield for 2019, he needs to work with the Board and the community on what Urban Shield's gonna look like, how it's being designed, how it's going to roll out, etc. etc. etc. for 2019. If that could be the contingency on which your motion is made then I can support it.

Haggerty: That's all acceptable, I'll accept that as an amendment.

Chan: Okay, that's a motion.

Carson: I'd like to offer a substitute motion.

Chan: Okay.

Haggerty: What? You already made a motion. How many you gonna do?

Carson: I don't know.

Chan: He can offer it. You can take it or not.

Haggerty: No, he's offering a substitute. He didn't ask for an amendment. He's offering a new motion.

Carson: Yeah, I'm offering a substitute motion.

Chan: I don't know what we do with that.

Carson: Yeah, looking in the rearview mirror at the just most recent motion, I'm making a substitute motion, and that is based on what just took place that this would be the last year for the funding of Urban Shield going forward, and that next year the funding for the UASI grant be something that's worked on between now and next year with the Sheriff's office and an ad hoc committee of individuals to look at what that grant would be.

Miley: Can I ask a question? When you say ad hoc, what do you have in mind? Is that Board members, is that –

Carson: I think that whatever that is, and maybe, I guess County Counsel would say I need to be very specific, that it would be appointed by one member of each of the Supervisors' offices, I mean you have the ability to appoint someone. Or you can participate yourself, that is your...

Valle: That would be my preference.

Carson: And that you work with the Sheriff's office in terms of the proposal for the funding of next year's UASI.

Haggerty: But that, I mean, we're basically saying that in the motion that I just put forward.

Carson: No, I'm saying that this is the last time we vote on it in this context.

Chan: I think the difference is, as I'm hearing it, is he's saying [points at Carson] that Urban Shield as it currently exists, not the funding, but the exercise—

Haggerty: I get it.

Miley: Can I withdraw my second, and second that one? [voice in room] I can? Okay, I withdraw my second, and second Supervisor Carson's substitute motion.

Chan: Okay, so why don't we just repeat it so we know what the motion is. You want to repeat it, so we know what it is?

Carson: That again, it's based on the fact that we could have two votes against it, it still goes on and on and on, and so, which is kind of what happened in the previous vote. That this would be the last time it's voted on as it's currently constituted, as Urban Shield is currently constituted. And that we spend the next year with a representative – it could a member of the Board – working with the Sheriff's on the next year's application for UASI, when then comes to the Board. But Urban Shield as we know it ends at the conclusion of today's vote, after this year's Urban Shield program, since it's already been kind of drafted.

Chan: And you seconded that?

Miley: Yes, I second that. She's frowning, but I don't know why. [points to County Counsel]

Chan: Is that clear or do you need something:

Counsel: So my only question is Supervisor Carson's motion as stated that it's the last time that Urban Shield is voted on. So if you read the recommendations before you, you are not exactly "voting on" Urban Shield.

Carson: We're voting on the funding for it.

Counsel: So, it's the understanding that some of that funding is going to be used for Urban Shield. So in terms of clarity, since I made have to interpret what you did later on, what I think I understand you to be saying is that a condition of your motion—

Carson: The entire concern here is around the \$1.5 million. That's really the concern. I think I've heard consistently from everybody, here and not here, who was here earlier and not here, that

the 4 million toward emergency preparedness, there's general agreement to that and there's no real dissension around that. The 1.5 million is the dissension.

Counsel: And I do understand that that's what you're saying. And I just want to make sure that there's clarity, and you can correct me if I'm stating this wrong, is that what you're saying is, not so much that this is the last time we will be voting on Urban Shield, but that a condition of your motion to approve, what you are moving to approve now is that Urban Shield will not be funded as it's currently constituted in the future.

Chan: for 2019.

Carson: 2019 when it comes back, when the UASI grant is back in place, that it does not come back to us in the current constitution that it is right now. That's more or less aligning itself with the proposal that Supervisor Chan came up with. It is now a \$5.5 million—

Chan: Grant, to be determined.

Carson: -- emergency preparedness effort. It is not a \$4 million emergency preparedness effort that deals with natural disasters and \$1.5 million that deals with manmade contingencies, that we have now.

Counsel: So I think that with that discussion there is clarity on what your motion is.

CAO: And just to clarify that would be the entire \$5.5 million, or whatever it is, that's available for 2018 that would support activities in 2019?

Carson: Absolutely right, and that does include the discussion of the exhibition part of it.

CAO: Anything currently covered under what is coined as Urban Shield, in this...

Miley: So I appreciate the motion, because what the motion says in my understanding based on the discussion is that Urban Shield as it's presently constituted, this would be the last year as it's presently constituted in 2018. Going forward Urban Shield, UASI, Supervisor Carson says we'll put together a committee that the Board appoints, one representative, and it could be the Board member to work with the Sheriff's Department on the UASI proposal and planning for whatever event will come out of that. Is that basically what you're saying Supervisor Carson?

Carson: That's absolutely what I'm saying, because on some level, I'm speaking only as Keith. Based on my current position on this Board I have a responsibility for the health, safety and welfare of the people in Alameda County, not just my district. Let me, kind of, a side note from that: I underscore the comment that Supervisor Miley made. I appreciate, as challenging as it may be, I appreciate the engagement of everybody in this effort. People who chose to come and to be as relentless on this issue as possible. I appreciate you as individuals and then as you recognize yourself with organizations, as an elected official that's information that's important

to me, just like data is important to me. I personally have a moral compass that's aside from that. And once I get to a point where I'm adding up how many of my constituents are speaking, versus where my moral compass is, I think that's a grey line for elected officials on any level, whether or not you're saying how much campaign contributions you're getting or not is dangerous, I think the same thing. Saying that is okay. Being here to represent your points of view is important, and I encourage, and even identifying your affiliation I think is important. But once it gets to a place where you're crossing a line, where you're making your decision by putting your finger in the wind and seeing which way it blows is extremely dangerous to me. And so this comment, this conversation that I'm having at the moment is really about how do we make sure that people are safe as best as possible under both scenarios – a natural disaster, and unfortunately if there is a person-made situation. And hopefully we can get to a place where it is not an urban war zone, us vs. them, it is actually as community how do we deal with these issues together.

Haggerty: I just don't know how you make a motion and a vote that basically tells me how I'm going to vote next time.

Carson: Yeah, it does, because you're participating in next time's vote, because you have a whole year to kind of structure it.

Chan: We have a motion and second. All in favor.

Carson, Miley, Chan, Valle: Aye.

Chan [looks at Haggerty]: What are you doing?

Haggerty: You got the next part.

Chan: Okay, I guess it's five ayes.

Haggerty: No.

Chan: Okay, you're a no?

Haggerty: No.

Chan: Okay, four ayes, one no. Motion passes.

[5:30:31]